



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

RECENT BOOKS ON THE HOMERIC DIALECT.

- I. Die homerische Ilias nach ihrer Entstehung betrachtet und in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt von AUGUST FICK. Göttingen: First Part 1885; Second Part 1886.
- II. The Growth of the Homeric Poems, by GEORGE WILKINS. Dublin, 1885.
- III. Introduction to the Language and Verse of Homer, by THOMAS D. SEYMOUR. Boston, 1885.

The publication in 1883 of a theory of the genesis of the Homeric poems—the most revolutionary that has appeared since the days of Friedrich August Wolf—in “Die homerische Odyssee in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt” of Fick, revived the interest attaching to the problem of the Homeric dialect, the solution of which is of such far-reaching importance to the critical historian of literature, to the student of the Greek epopee, and to the investigator of the dialects of Hellas. The study of Homeric forms received, upon the promulgation of this theory, a renewed stimulus; and the number of publications which owe their *raison d'être* to this, the κατ' ἐξοχήν most startling innovation upon the traditional doctrines of the supereminence of Ionic genius in the cultivation of epic poetry, offers a new proof of that keen acumen connate with daring boldness, and that power to govern linguistic phenomena, which the Göttingen professor has heretofore displayed in fields of investigation embracing a wider horizon.

Conscious of the Jacobinism of his views, Fick was prepared to meet the antagonism or even the vituperation (for the student of the *literae humaniores* is upon occasion *inhumanissimus*) of the classical philologists of the *stare super vias antiquas* type, whose judgment he considered valueless, since they seemed to him to possess neither an adequate knowledge of Greek morphology nor a keen insight into the interrelation of the Greek dialects, the intermixture of which in the Homeric poems he has been, according to many, the first to successfully explain. At the outset he made the announcement that he would attempt to repel only those attacks which seemed to imperil the cardinal features of his theory, which are, in brief, as follows:

Tradition bears manifold witness to an Aiolic Homer, and the authority of Dicaearchus, the scholar of Aristotle, may well be invoked when he gives utterance to the assertion that the Homeric poems were originally Aiolic. That Dicaearchus was correct is proved by an examination of the peculiar position occupied by the traces of Aiolic influence in Homer. The Aiolic ingredients embedded in the grotesque mixture of Hellenic and barbarous forms preserved in our texts, do not owe their existence to an original design on the part of the Ionic ποιηταί to tinge a creation of their genius with an

Aiolic coloring which should recall the memories of a far-off Aiolic epos which had perished in the wrack of time. These Aiolisms owe their admission into our present text to the fact that the Ionians, when they received the epic forms from the original composers, the Aiolians, and translated the poems into their epichoristic dialect, either had no metrical equivalents for these Aiolic forms or did not possess the words in question (*e. g.*, *θεά*). The hypothesis of an Aiolic Homer is thus, according to Fick, elevated beyond any doubt by the possibility of a retranslation into the original Aiolic, those Ionisms which do not submit to such a retranslation being found in passages which are the production of Ionic Homerids, and branded as spurious by the consentient verdict of the 'Ομηρικώτατοι of ancient and modern criticism.

It is not the purpose of this notice to subject to a detailed examination from the point of view of diplomatic criticism a theory of such far-reaching consequence. For the present at least we propose to collect, and submit to a brief examination, such of the results of Fick's investigations as are of significance for the science of Greek dialectology.

According to Fick, the present text of the Iliad, which rests on an Attic recension dating shortly after 500, is sutured together out of the following pieces:

I. Μῆνις 'Αχιλλέως. A 1-610, 12 lines of B, Θ 55, Δ 57-805, Ο 592-595, 415-418, 716-746, Π 1-155, 212-296, 656-867, Σ 1-315, Τ about 76 lines, Υ 39 lines, Φ 1-227, 515-611, Χ 1-394. In all about 2250 lines.

II. Extension of the Μῆνις. Δ 575-848, Μ, Ν, Ξ, Ο 1-414, Π 155-197, 306-683, 805-817, Ρ 1-761, Σ 82-242, 316-478, 610-617, Τ 1-39, Χ 395-515, Ψ 1-257, Ω 3-803. About 4560 lines.

III. Οἶτος 'Ιλίου. Β 48-483, 811-826, Γ, Δ, Ε, Ζ, Η, Θ 1-55. About 2860 lines.

IV. Extension at the hands of the poet who inserted the Οἶτος. Θ 55-565, Δ 1-57, Ο 415-746, Υ 1-380, Φ 385-513. About 1300 lines.

V. Ionic redaction of Cynaithos of Chios about the middle of the sixth century. Several passages in A and B, B 484-877, in Δ, Ε, Ζ 119-236, Η, Θ, all Ι, all Κ, Σ 483-609, the greater part of Τ, Υ and Ψ 257-849, and in general all passages throughout the entire Iliad which cannot be retranslated into Aiolic. In all about 4850 lines.

The author of the extension of the Μῆνις Fick holds to be a Lesbian, for several reasons: 1. The mention of the dawn spreading its light over the sea, Ψ 227. 2. The exact topographical knowledge of the Troad displayed by the author. 3. The Boeotians, who were settlers in Lesbos, are the first brought into battle. 4. Epic poetry was cultivated at Lesbos—*e. g.*, by Lesches.

The arguments that have led Fick to the conclusion that the 'Ιλίου οἶτος and its extension are the productions of a Cyprian poet are *inter alia* as follows:

1. The name Κύπρις is used for Aphrodite in Ε alone. 2. Ἀργεῖ παντί must comprise Salamis, the metropolis of the Cyprian Salamis. 3. In Δ 275-282 the allusion to Aias and Teukros. 4. The glorification of Salamis, Η 195-199. 5. Cyprian forms: ἀκοστήσας, Ζ 506 (ἀκοστή · κριθή παρὰ Κυπρίους). The infinitive form in φορῆναι is restricted to the dialects of Arcadia and Cyprus; ἰδέ "and" occurs in prose in the dialect of Cyprus alone, and is found 19

times in the *Οἶτος* and its extension, twice in the hymn to Aphrodite—which Fick holds to be of Cyprian origin—and in no other hymn, with the exception of that in praise of Demeter, which is composed in a mixed dialect. 6. The tradition that Homer was a Cyprian, Pausan. X 24, 3. 7. The frequent mention of Cyprian heroes.

The *Κατάλογος* was originally Cyprian, but inserted by an Ionian; immovable Ionisms are but few, and found only in the later Ionic additions. The *Πρεσβεία* is younger than the Cyprian redaction of *Θ.*, but can be retranslated into Aiolic, though fixed Ionisms are not wanting. Fick regards the author of the ninth book either as an Ionian who was skilled in the art of using the Aiolic of the older epic, or as a rhapsode who composed in the mixed Aiolo-Ionic of the sixth century, which came into existence after such older portions as the *Μῆνις* had been Ionized. The epic poetry of the Ionians before 550 is genuine Aiolic, but the Arimaspea of Aristeas (525 B. C.) is full of immovable Ionisms. The *Δολώνεια* can be Aiolized, though its author may be one of the older Ionians. The books containing the *Πρεσβεία* and the *Δολώνεια*, though demonstrably younger than any other portion of the *Iliad*, cannot, nevertheless, have been the work of a poet without some touch of the divine afflatus. Their late origin leads us to expect the presence of a greater mass of fixed Ionic forms than found elsewhere; that this is not the case is one of the weak positions of Fick's theory, which is ever liable to prove too much (e. g., in the case of the Theoklymenos episode). The Shield of Achilles and the *Ἄθλα ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ* were originally Aiolic, but at a later period intermixed with Ionisms, the handiwork of the redactor; the latter is not older than 680.

The critique of Christ in the *Philol. Anzeiger* XIV fails to grapple with the essential features of the new hypothesis, except where he makes the assertion that the transformation of an Aiolic into an Ionic Homer is without a parallel in the history of literature, and that Greek history offers no instance of such dialect-transformation. Fick attempts to invalidate this statement by transcribing several fragments of Terpander, Simonides, etc., into that original dialect in which he conceives them to have been composed. To escape the charge of having involved himself in a vicious circle, Fick must overthrow the theory of early dialect-mixture as formulated by Ahrens in 1852. A necessary complement to his reproduction of Homer in the Aiolic form must be a review of all early lyric and elegiac poetry in the light of such a hypothesis. Whatever be the result of this investigation, which has already been attempted for Pindar with doubtful success, one fact is certain—the neglect of the study of the Greek dialects on the basis of the epigraphic monuments and in the light of comparative grammar has engendered an almost blind reverence for the authority of Bergk, who not unfrequently presents a heterogeneity of dialectical combinations which is supposed to enhance our admiration for the plasticity of Greek art, but which in reality obscures our vision of the exact relation of melic poetry to the cantonal dialect. Thus we are requested to read with equanimity and to find an indication of the aesthetical conservatism of the Greeks in such a combination of forms as that found in a fragment of Alcman, the chorus-master of the Spartans: *χρύσιον ἄγγος ἔχουσα μέγαν σκύφον | ὅλα τε ποιμένες ἔχουσιν.*

A more serious onslaught upon Fick's theory has been made by Cauer

(Zeitsch. f. Gymnasialwesen X), who maintains that in those portions of the Odyssey which are indisputably ancient, Ionic forms are found for which the Aiolic cannot be substituted—*e. g.*, diphthongs, which came into existence from the expulsion of *F*, as in *παῖς*. Cauer assumes that if, in that stage of the development of the Aiolic idiom represented by Alcaeus and Sappho, *F* was preserved intact at the beginning of a word and as *v* after the augment, it is incredible that it should have disappeared between vowels at the time when Homer was Aiolic, according to Fick. To this it may be replied that inner *F* is not found in Aiolic; that the conjunction of vowels originally held apart by *F* is Aiolic; that Ionic poets use both the open and the contracted forms; and that in other dialects *F* is found between vowels (*Διφι*) and has disappeared (*Δι*). Cauer's argumentation is not cogent, since a form like *παῖς* can be Aiolic as well as Ionic. Though the existence of the dual in Homer has been regarded as proof of the Ionic character of his poems, it can be shown that Ionians as well as Aioliens lost the dual in the earliest period of their dialect-life. Finally, Cauer's assertion that *ā*-forms, as *θεά*, *λαός*, *Ἀτρεΐδαι*, are old Ionic (which view is also held by Brugmann), is to be met with the counter-assertion that it would be impossible for the same dialect to possess at the same time the corresponding *η*-forms, *Λευκοθέη*, *νηός*, *Ἀτρεΐδεω*. (See Bechtel's refutation of Brugmann's statements in a recent No. of Philol. Anzeiger.)

Hinrichs, in the Deutsche Literaturzeitung, has offered to Fick's theory the objection that *Πέρραμος* is the Aiolic, *Πρίαμος* the Ionic form. The analogy of *κόπρια*, later Aiolic *κόπερρα*, fails to militate against the assumption that *Πρίαμος* is also Aiolic.

Perhaps the most salient argument against an Aiolic Homer is the fact that both *ān* and *ké* are found in our text. In Attica, Ionia and Arcadia *ān* was in use, *ká*, a Doric prose form, in the Peloponnesus and in North Greece (also in Boeotia and Elis), *ké*, *kén* in Thessaly, Aiolis and Cyprus. *κε ān* is a combination occurring in the dialect of Arcadia alone. Fick assumes that for *ké ān* has been substituted, and shows that in the dialect of the older Ionic poets there occur 21 cases of *ān* for which *ké* may be substituted, and 22 cases where *ān* is immovable. In Homer, however, their interrelation is different. In the old *Νόστος* of the Odyssey the ratio of movable to immovable *ān* is 18 : 4; in the continuation of the old *Νόστος*, the revenge of Odysseus, 30 : 4; in the younger *Νόστος* 7 : 3; in the Telemachy 10 : 3; in the *Μῆνις* 15 : 7; in the extension of the *Μῆνις* 26 : 5; in the *Οἶτος* and in the insertions necessary to complete its junction with the *Μῆνις*, *ān* can be replaced by *ké* by the adoption of occasional conjectures which, in the opinion of Fick, do not seem over-daring. It is evident that the larger proportion of immovable *ān* in the Iliad, the older poem, does not argue much for the correctness of the hypothesis that *ān* has been forced into our text, for the greater part, at the hands of the Ionic rhapsode Cynaithos.

A series of noticeable observations upon Homeric grammar and the interrelations of the dialects concludes the volume. To the Aioliisms Fick now adds the rhyme established, for example, by reading *-οισι* for *-ονσι*, as in *μάρτυροι ἀμφοτέρωσι θεοὶ τοὶ Ὀλύμπιον ἔχουσιν*. But Fick does not show that the Aioliens were especially addicted to the use of rhyme, nor is this probable *per se*. Of interest is the differentiation in the dialects of *εἰς* and *ἐς*. *εἰς* Fick holds to

be Aiolic, ἐς to be Ionic. In the oldest portions of the *Odyssey* and in the *Mēnis*, ἐς can be readily eliminated by conjecture. In the case of *Οἶτος*, however, ἐς is frequently immovable, and is regarded by Fick as the Ionic representation of the *iv* of the Cyprian dialect, in which the *Οἶτος* and that portion necessary for the insertion of the *Οἶτος* in the *Mēnis* were originally composed. An examination of the epic fragments leads Fick to the conclusion that those which are older than 550 are capable of retranslation into Aiolic—a proceeding impossible in the case of others whose origin must be ascribed to a later date. The 99 ineradicable Ionisms in the 305 verses of the *Βατραχομουμαχία* of Pigres of Halicarnassus are indisputable proof of the increasing supremacy exercised over the epos by the Ionians, inasmuch as no such proportion is found in any equal number of verses of early origin.

The foundation of Fick's theory of the linguistic form of Greek epic poetry rests upon arguments which he has developed chiefly in his *Odyssee*, where material is adduced sufficient to control his assumptions. This abstract of the results contained in his recension of the *Iliad*, together with some scattered observations thereupon, will be followed at some future date by a criticism of the plausibility of the theory itself.

The volume by Mr. Wilkins, late Scholar of Trinity College, Dublin, is a representative of that tendency in scholarship which is easily satisfied with an artistic compilation of the latest German theories, without affording the unsophisticated the desirable information from what authorities he has amassed his materials. It is therefore not to be expected that he should have enlightened our knowledge of Homeric grammar by any originality of his own. As Niese, Bonitz and Helbig have been drawn upon without notice to the reader for a large portion of his book, it must be regarded as an instance of the art *de s'égarer avec méthode*, or of a surprising eccentricity on the part of Mr. Wilkins, when in Chapter XIII he assures us that Fick is the promulgator of the theory of the origin of the dialect mixture in the Homeric poems which we have sketched above. It would have afforded us some satisfaction if Mr. Wilkins had affixed to his reproduction of pages 1-39 of Fick's *Odyssee* some criticism of his own besides the adjectives "brilliant" and "daring." The student eager to learn of recent work in Homeric grammar will scarcely be satisfied with a summary of a single theory, be it false or true. Of Hinrichs' dissertation, or of Christ's *Ilias*, or treatise *Die Interpolationen bei Homer vom metrischen und sprachlichen Gesichtspunkte beleuchtet*, there is no mention. Mr. Wilkins' "agnostic standpoint" must be very agnostic.

We welcome with pleasure Prof. Seymour's *Introduction to the Language and Verse of Homer*, which contains in a clear and comprehensive form a survey of the cardinal features of the Homeric dialect, fortified by the well-known scholarship of its author. The purpose of this volume is essentially practical—to relieve the commentary of that mass of burdensome details which, when relegated to their proper connection, are necessary to the understanding of Homeric forms. As Prof. Seymour does not claim for his book either exhaustiveness of treatment or a presentation of the material from a thoroughly scientific point of view, it is necessary that he should couch many of his state-

ments in such authoritative language that the tyro in Homer, for whose use the volume is adapted, may build his faith upon the rock that cannot be swept away by the flood of a contemporary criticism which seeks its high-water mark in the pre-Ionic period of the epos. No reference can therefore be made to the probable chronology of certain portions of the text, and contractions, etc., must be registered which many scholars either expel from the text as occurring in interpolated passages (*e. g.* *λωτοῦντα* M 283; the termination in *ἀκταῖς* 284 is suspicious) or resolve into the uncontracted forms.

That portion which concerns the dialect constitutes half the volume—the discussion of Homeric style and Homeric syntax occupying pages 1–33, that on Homeric verse pages 81–94—and is admirably adapted to fulfil the purpose of its author; and we do not recollect to have observed the omission of any phenomenon of essential importance to the understanding of the language of Homer.

The interest attaching to any publication that deals with that *crux criticorum*, Homeric morphology, is so great that we beg leave to offer for Prof. Seymour's kind consideration some remarks in reference to a few of his statements which seem to us not incapable of modification.

4 *f.* There are three passages in Archilochus showing the influence of the labial spirant: I 'Ενναλίου ἀνακτος, XXIX 2 ἡ δέ οἱ κόμη, XCVII 1 ἡ δέ οἱ σάθη; whereas we read, "No trace appears in Archilochus." Of course these are merely Epic reminiscences; that is proven by the 21 violations of *F* in the other poems of the Parian poet. It is not absolutely certain that the strong form *θέρος* in *Θεροίτης* is Aiolic, although probable enough, since it is found in the Lesbian, Boeotian, Thessalian and Arcadian dialects. The base *θερο-* is found in proper names also in inscriptions from Sparta, Athens, Chios, Corcyra, etc.—5 *e.* For *ἐννεκα* read *έννεκα* with Aiolic *ψίλωσις*; cf. *τοῦνεκα* A 291; *βόλεται* has the same claim to the epithet "Aiolic" as *βόλλεται*; cf. *βόλα* GDS 239, Mitylene, where there is no trace of the second *λ*. This is, as far as I know, the only instance of the reduction in this word. The Arcadian *τὸμ βολόμενον* GDS 1222, 24, the Cyprian *βόλε*, and the Pamphylian *βολήμενος*, prove the Aiolic character of the Homeric *βόλεται*. The relation of *πούς* to *-πος* in *ἀελλόπος ἀρτίπος τρίπος* has not yet been explained. The breaking down of the law that monosyllables should be long by nature or by position, or its infringement by analogy, may suffice to explain the Laconian *πόρ* and Homeric *-πος* from **πῶς*, later *πούς*.—6 *e. ia* is not contracted into *ι* in *ἀκοίτις*; *ἀκοίτις* is from **ἀκοιτι-νς*, as *δῖς* from **δῠνς*. We should take as our starting-point an original form rather than an analogical formation in *-ας* (cf. *πόλιας*), which finally underwent the violent contraction into *ι*.—11 *f.* It can hardly be said that apocope was the rule in the Boeotian dialect. *Κατά* suffers apocope only before the article, *πεδά* never; *ποτί* is found in *ποτιωδόμενον*, etc.; *ἀνά* and *παρά*, it is true, always elide the final *α*. *πρός* is not from *πορτί* (which would give a form *προσί*), but from *πορτ + σ*; cf. *ἐν + σ = εἰς*, etc.—12 *i.* The so-called "parasitic" *τ* in *πτόλως*, etc., is nothing more than an affection of *π + jod*; cf. *βδ* from *gv + jod* in *βδέλλω*, and *φθ* from *ghv + jod* in *φθίνω*.—12 *j.* The identity of *ξύν* and *σύν* cannot be maintained.—12 *l.* The etymology of *ἰημι* from *ζῆημι* is absolutely incorrect, though upheld by Curtius. The *√sē* (cf. *sēmen sātus*) is now almost universally accepted. *ὦς* is not from *ζῶς*, but from *φῶς*, Goth.

svē. Curtius' influence has done much to propagate this widespread belief in the potency of *jod*, which disappeared between vowels as early as the age of Homer (e. g. *τρεῖς*); before vowels it occasionally left in the *spiritus asper* indication of its former presence. The other *jod* (for there were two in Greek originally) became ζ.—12 *o*. Would it not have been more scientific and equally clear to have said that σ is added in ἐξ, οὗτος, πῶς?—14. The following instances of the occurrence of *F* might well be added: *Φηχῆ, Φέκηλος, Φέρρων, Φέθειραι, Φέλωρ, Φετώσις, Φέτης, Φίρις, Φίρος, Φίμαι, Φέλω, "seem," Φίδιος, Φοῖγνυμι*.—16 *c*. ἐνμμελίω Δ 47 is not from -ίης, but from -ίως; cf. ἡύκομος: κόμη. The *ā*-stems are occasionally interchangeable with *o*-stems. *Αἰνεῖω* and *Βορέω*, the other two forms quoted for the contraction of -εω to -ω < *āo*, occur before a vowel, so we may read *ā*; cf. 7 *d*.—18. The statement that with the exception of the *ι*-stems the dative singular ending *ι* is found only *sub ictu*, would have at least left the question open in reference to the *ι* of the dative of those 16 words which have the *ultima* long. It is by no means certain that the *ι* of Latin has anything to do with the *ι* of Greek.—18 *p*. The theory of the "insertion" of an *ε* in certain stem-forms of *ι* and *υ*-stems ought not to be further propagated nor to find entrance even into a book designed for beginners.—24 *d*. The statement in reference to *ἄμμε* and *ἡμέας* is not exact. It is true that *ἄμμες* may be substituted for *ἡμεῖς* when (1) the latter stands (as in a large majority of cases) at the beginning of the hexameter, where it is followed by *μέν, δέ*, etc., and when (2) *ἡμεῖς* forms the sixth foot. But *ἡμέας* is immovable 19 times (1st foot 9 times, 2d 1, 3d 2, 4th 7, 5th 1). *ἄμμε* can find entrance into the text of Homer in these passages only in case recourse be had to conjectures, which Prof. Seymour would doubtless stigmatize as savoring of too great boldness. The substitution is feasible seven times. Whatever theory may be held as regards the fortunes of the Homeric epos, it cannot be denied that the statement that *ἄμμες ἄμμε* are found in our text, where the Ionic dialect presents no metrical equivalents, would at least facilitate the understanding of the tyro.—24 *V r*. "The stem *τι-* is drawn into the second declension by the addition of *ο* and *τιο-* becomes *τεο-*; cf. *πόλις* and *πόλεως*." This assertion, in which Prof. Seymour agrees with Curtius, Renner and Windisch, is indefensible, since *τεο-* is original. The palatalization of the guttural does not necessitate the *ι*-coloring of the vowel. As in *τεοῖο*, gen. of the personal pronoun, we have the stem *τεο-*, so in *τέον*, Archil. 95. The stem *τεο-* has, however, nothing whatever to do with *τι-*. This *τι-* was extended in the first instance by *υ* (*τι-υ-ός*), in the second by *ο*—a phenomenon specifically Aiolic (*τίω, τίσαιν*, Hesychius *δτίωσιν*). If in Lesbian *ε* passed with any great frequency into *ι*, we might accept with greater certainty an explanation diametrically opposed to that advocated by Prof. Seymour; at least it is more probable that *τίω* is < *τέω*—an original and Ionic form—though neither in the dialect of Lesbos nor in that of *Αἰολίς* is *ι* < *ε* very common. *χρύσεος*, we may remark in passing, is not the ground-form of *χρύσιος*, as has been maintained by Johannes Schmidt. *ι* arises from *ε* before nasals, σ + consonant, σσ, κ, and frequently before vowels in the dialects of Boeotia, Crete, Laconia, Cyprus, Messenia and Argos. The dialect most closely connected with that of Lesbos which offers an instance of *ι* < *ε* is the Thessalian. In no case could the *ι* of *τιο-* become *ε*. The analogy of *πόλις πόλεως* is incorrect. The -*εως* form is from the analogy of the gen. of nouns in -*εις*; *πόλις* and *πόλεως*

are therefore morphogonically different forms. *τεο-* is < *τρυο-* = Old-Bactr. *cahyā*. —29 *h*. Emend *μυθέειαι*. —33 *d*. A reference to the conjectural readings *δαήω* and *τραπήομεν* might have been inserted with profit; otherwise the student would fail to understand the similarity in formation of *δαείω* and *δαμήης*. The conjectural readings were adduced 34 *d*.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

Études Critiques sur Propertius et ses élégies. Par FRÉDÉRIC PLESSIS. Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1884.

There is a sense in which M. Plessis' *Études Critiques sur Propertius* may fairly claim to be one of the most important contributions to the subject yet published. For the first time students of Propertius are presented with data for forming a true estimate of the age of the *Neapolitanus*, the debatable point round which all recent criticism has turned. M. Plessis has examined the famous codex with his own eyes at Wolfenbüttel, and has photographed six pages of it; which photographed specimens are given at the end of his volume, and may be said to settle the question of date finally. The authority of the first of French palaeographers, M. Léopold Delisle, as well as M. Chatelain, has pronounced the MS to belong to the end of the twelfth or beginning of the thirteenth century; and I am able to confirm their judgment by that of our own great expert, Mr. E. M. Thompson, who unhesitatingly assigns it to the end of the twelfth century. It will be remembered that Messrs. Lucian Müller and Bährens agreed in considering the MS to be much later, the former ascribing it to the fourteenth, or preferably the fifteenth century; the latter not only believing it to be written after 1430, but finding in it traces of unmistakable interpolation. It is satisfactory to be reassured by the incontestable evidence of fact, and to find the conclusions of Lachmann and Keil completely verified by the independent judgment of the first modern authorities in palaeography. All the conclusions which have been drawn from the supposed late date of the *Neapolitanus* must henceforward be considered to be disproved: if the MS is interpolated, such interpolation must be shown to rest on other than palaeographical arguments; if it is *not*, as I, with A. Palmer, Leo and most others, believe, the supporters of its sincerity may henceforward start with one of the most important of all vouchers, its comparative antiquity. By comparative I mean as compared with the other Propertian codices; for none of these can claim a date nearly as early.

M. Plessis, then, deserves our particular gratitude for this signal service, and if his *Études* possessed no other claim to distinction but this, they must on this ground only be allowed to rank far above the numerous *Quaestiones Propertianae* which year after year pour from the presses of Germany. I can truly say that I know few accounts of the MSS of particular authors more interesting for style or matter than the chapter which M. Plessis devotes to the MSS of Propertius; more than anything which I have yet seen, it is calculated to make even listless readers aware of the growing importance of the *res diplomatica*; if indeed this were not sufficiently evident alike from the obvious uneasiness of those who know nothing about it, and the growing suspicion (even in Cambridge) that philology *may*, after all, develop in a non-syntactic direction!